

Unit Accreditation and Program Approval

October 2012

Overview of this Report

This item provides information on the history of the Commission's accreditation processes. The Commission has requested an agenda item that discusses the benefits and challenges of unit accreditation. There have been some concerns expressed that the Commission's current accreditation system with its focus on unit accreditation does not adequately review or place sanctions on individual programs and does not have the ability to close a specific program at an institution.

As a result, an accreditation agenda item is planned for the December 2012 Commission meeting which will address this topic. The December 2012 meeting is when the Annual Report from the COA will be presented so the COA Co-chairs will be present at that meeting. Staff requests that the COA Co-chairs assist in the presentation of the December 2012 agenda item that discusses unit accreditation. This discussion at this COA meeting will inform the development of the December 2012 Commission agenda item.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

The Introduction of the adopted *Accreditation Handbook* (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook.html>) provides some historical information about the Commission's accreditation system

Under the auspices of Senate Bills 148 (Bergeson, 1988) and 655 (Bergeson, 1993), the education community in California launched an initiative to create a professional accreditation and certification system that would contribute to excellence in California public education well into the 21st Century. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), the nation's oldest independent teaching standards board, has long engaged in credential program reviews. The original *Accreditation Framework*, developed by the Accreditation Advisory Council to replace program review, represented a unique, pioneering effort to advance the quality of educator preparation through the creation of an integrated accreditation *and* certification system. The Accreditation Framework of December, 2007, details the requirements of the CTC's revised accreditation system and informed this version of the *Handbook*.

The 2007 *Accreditation Framework* substantially changed the accreditation process. This handbook documents the procedures the Committee on Accreditation (COA) has put in place to implement the CTC's Accreditation System. The COA encourages both approved institutions and Board of Institutional Review (BIR) members to utilize this handbook. The COA is committed to providing full disclosure of its accreditation process to all.

The purposes of this accreditation system are

- To be accountable to the public and the educator preparation profession regarding the knowledge, skills, and abilities of educators prepared in California.

- To promote quality — both in educator preparation and in candidate performance.
- To ensure that all educator preparation programs prepare all prospective educators to support students in acquiring the knowledge and skills defined in California's K-12 Student Academic Content Standards.
- To support all programs in focusing on continuous improvement based on the analysis of candidate competence data.

A much more detailed history of California's educator preparation program review and accreditation processes was provided in the Accreditation Study Session that was presented to the Commission in May 2005 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2005-05/2005-05-6A.pdf>). The first five pages of that agenda item are provided in Appendix B.

Currently, California's Education Code §44374 (d) specifies that the COA makes a single accreditation decision for an institution and all of its educator preparation programs.

- (d) **The Committee on Accreditation shall make a single decision to accredit, to accredit with stipulations, or to deny accreditation to an institution's credential programs, pursuant to Section 44373 and the accreditation framework.**

Approaches to Program Review and Approval and Institutional Review and Accreditation

A variety of organizations operate review and approval or accreditation systems. Each system has its own requirements and accreditation by the different entities allows an institution to do different activities or make specific claims. The Commission accredits an institution by implementing a unit accreditation system which includes a strong program review component. Accreditation by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing allows an entity to operate educator preparation programs and recommend individuals for licenses to teach or provide services in California's public schools.

Unit Accreditation

The six regional accrediting bodies accredit *institutions* of higher education. Accreditation of an institution by a regional accreditor indicates that the institution has met a specified standard regarding the infrastructure of the organization, the identified student learning outcomes, and educational effectiveness. Regional accreditation allows an institution to award units that are accepted at other regionally accredited institutions.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is a professional accrediting agency that focuses on educator preparation, and yet there is a program component to the process. NCATE primarily focuses on the *education unit*. The education unit is comprised of each program at the institution that is designed for P-12 educators and results in a credential or advanced degree. In many cases, the education unit is synonymous with the School or College of Education. However, in other cases, educator preparation programs may take place outside of the School or College of Education and the unit then, is a term to describe all of the relevant programs that together prepare educators for public school service. The NCATE standards focus on six broad concepts: Candidate Knowledge and Skills, Assessment and Unit Evaluation, Field Experience, Diversity, Faculty, and Governance and Resources. NCATE requires that each institution seeking its accreditation participate in national professional organization program review or state program review. The information collected as part of the program review is provided by the institution as evidence toward meeting the NCATE standards.

California has a protocol with NCATE that allows a California institution that is interested in earning NCATE accreditation to use the work toward NCATE accreditation in its accreditation work for California. Meeting the NCATE Unit standards means that the institution only has to address four sentences from the Commission's Common Standards that are not clearly addressed in the NCATE standards. All other concepts in the Commission's Common Standards are satisfied if the institution meets the NCATE Unit Standards.

Individual Review of Each Approved Program

In California, the Commission implemented a program review system from 1973 through the mid 1990s. When a program review visit took place at the institution, a very large number of team members was necessary because each program at the institution was reviewed by a separate team. It was, in essence, a number of program review visits taking place at the same time, with each team preparing separate reports. It was reported that in this system, the reviews had difficulty maintain consistency because a separate teams focused on each program area. Separate reports were prepared and presented for each program at the institution.

National professional organizations, such as the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and many others organizations, review a preparation program and provide feedback on that specific program. In the case of the national professional associations, if the program meets the standards of the organization, the program is said to be nationally accredited.

Many institutions choose to seek national accreditation for individual program areas. In the same manner that the California system allows the documents and procedures for NCATE to meet state requirements, the current accreditation system supports programs in School Psychology, School Counseling and Speech-Language Pathology to use the national professional association accreditation documentation in the California accreditation process.

Unit Accreditation Plus Review of Each Approved Program

The Commission's current accreditation system includes submission of data—candidate competence and program effectiveness—on a routine basis. The system includes a full review of the key assessments, course syllabi, and the program narrative—description of how the program meets the Commission's adopted standards—once in each seven year accreditation cycle. If a program is found to not be meeting one or more of the Commission's program standards, the team report states this finding. The COA may place one or more stipulations on the institution and focus the stipulation directly on a specific program.

The Commission's accreditation system also requires each institution to meet the Commission's adopted Common Standards (provided in Appendix C). The Common Standards address the education unit—each Commission-approved educator preparation program that leads to a credential or authorization to teach or provide a service in California's public schools.

Accreditation Study Work Group 2004-2006

The Commission sponsored an advisory panel during 2004-2006 which studied the accreditation system and made a number of recommendations. The topic of unit accreditation and individual program was thoroughly discussed by this advisory group. The group reviewed information from other professions in California and education in other states and countries.

The consensus recommendation from the advisory panel was to retain the Commission's unit

accreditation focus but to also ensure that each approved educator preparation program is held to the Commission's adopted program standards. Provided below is the recommendation and supporting rationale as it was presented to the Commission at the July-August 2006 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2006-08/2006-08-6B.pdf>).

Preferred Option: **Revise the system such that it addresses unit accreditation and enhances program review.**

Background: Currently, California's accreditation system involves a single accreditation decision for the institution, in other words, unit accreditation. The individual programs are approved within the process of coming to the institution's accreditation decision. This system is often referred to as "unit plus" because it focuses on the program sponsor and all its credential programs.

Rationale: In gathering feedback from the constituencies represented on the Work Group, it was clear that there is overwhelming support for continuing a "unit" based system. Deans and administrators of education preparation commented that the unit based system allows them some degree of leverage with the university or district to initiate or implement improvements in programs, particularly with those programs that are out of their direct control. However, concerns were raised that accreditation review team members have sometimes failed to sufficiently address program concerns in the report for fear of risking the accreditation status of the institution. This seemed to occur most often with larger institutions that might have one identified weak program among several strong programs. It was acknowledged that this is in part a structural issue and, in part, one of implementation and training.

One of the major ways in which the proposed system will enhance program review is that under the proposed system, findings for each standard of each credential program would be included in the accreditation report, rather than just findings on the common standards. In addition, the program review team would recommend whether review of a particular program should be part of a larger site visit at the institution or district office.

A question that has been asked is, "***Can the Commission directly close a program under the current accreditation system?***" The answer is "No" the Commission cannot require an institution to close a specific program. But the COA can and does have the power and authority to place program specific stipulations on an institution and then require follow-up until those stipulations have been met. This can (and does) lead to the closing of ineffective programs, because the Commission accreditation of the institution can be jeopardized if it does not deal with correcting the deficiencies identified in the stipulations. Since the COA does not have the authority to directly close a program, another question can be posed, "***Should the COA be provided with the authority and flexibility to close a specific program?***" If the COA would discuss this question, the information will be included in the Commission agenda item planned for December 2012.

Next Steps

The COA's discussion of these concepts will inform the development of the agenda item for the December 2012 Commission meeting.

Appendix A

California Education Code §§44370-44374

44370. The Legislature finds and declares that the competence and performance of professional educators depends in part on the quality of their academic and professional preparation. The Legislature recognizes that standards of quality in collegiate preparation complement standards of candidate competence and performance, and that general standards and criteria regarding the overall quality of a candidate's preparation are as essential as the assessment of the candidate's competence and performance.

44371. (a) The system for accreditation of educator preparation shall do all of the following:

- (1) Concentrate on the overall quality of educator preparation in credential programs.
- (2) Hold professional elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educators responsible for quality in the preparation of professional practitioners.
- (3) Contribute to improvements in educator preparation and recognize excellence in preparation programs and institutions.
- (4) Be governed by an accreditation framework that sets forth the policies of the commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation.

(b) The accreditation framework shall do all of the following:

- (1) Establish broad, flexible policies and standards for accreditation of educator preparation.
- (2) Define the accreditation responsibilities, authority, and roles of the commission and the Committee on Accreditation.
- (3) Establish an accreditation system that is efficient and cost effective.
- (4) Require that accreditation decisions be based on sufficient, reliable evidence about the quality of educator preparation.

44372. The powers and duties of the commission regarding the accreditation system shall include the following:

- (a) Adopt and implement an accreditation framework, which sets forth the policies of the commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California.
- (b) Establish and modify credential-specific standards, experimental program standards, and alternative program standards, as defined in the adopted accreditation framework.
- (c) Rule on the eligibility of an applicant for accreditation when the applying institution has not previously prepared educators for state Certification in California, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44227.
- (d) Appoint and reappoint the members of the Committee on Accreditation, in accordance with Section 44373, by selecting among nominees submitted by a panel of distinguished educators.
- (e) Review periodic accreditation reports by the Committee on Accreditation, and refer accreditation issues and concerns to the committee for its examination and response.
- (f) Hear and resolve appeals of accreditation decisions, pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 44374.
- (g) Allocate resources annually for implementation of the accreditation system.

- (h) With the Committee on Accreditation, jointly design an evaluation of accreditation policies and their implementation.
- (i) Inform and advise the Legislature regarding statutory issues related to accreditation, and submit legislative recommendations, after considering the advice of the Committee on Accreditation, educational institutions, and professional organizations.

44373. (a) There is hereby established the Committee on Accreditation consisting of 12 members selected for their distinguished records of accomplishment in **education**. Six members shall be from postsecondary **education** institutions, and six shall be certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of **education** in California. No member shall serve on the committee as a representative of any organization or institution. Membership shall be, to the maximum extent possible, balanced in terms of ethnicity, gender, and geographic regions. The committee shall include members from elementary and secondary schools, and members from public and private institutions of postsecondary **education**.

(b) The terms of committee members shall be in accordance with the accreditation framework. Appointment of the initial committee members shall be from nominees submitted by a panel of distinguished educators, who are named by a consensus of the commission and the accreditation advisory council, pursuant to Section 44371, as that section read on December 31, 1993. Appointment of subsequent committee members shall be from nominees submitted by a distinguished panel named by a consensus of the commission and the Committee on Accreditation. For each committee position to be filled by the commission, the panel shall submit two highly qualified nominees.

(c) The committee shall do, but shall not be limited to doing, all of the following:

- (1) Make decisions about the accreditation of educator preparation. The committee's decision making process shall be in accordance with the accreditation framework.
- (2) Make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation in accordance with procedures established by the committee.
- (3) Determine the comparability of standards submitted by applicants with those adopted by the commission, in accordance with the accreditation framework.
- (4) Adopt guidelines for accreditation reviews, and monitor the performance of accreditation teams and other aspects of the accreditation system.
- (5) Present an annual accreditation report to the commission and respond to accreditation issues and concerns referred to the committee by the commission.

44374. (a) The accreditation framework shall include common standards that relate to aspects of program quality that are the same for all credential programs. The framework shall also include multiple options for program standards.

(b) The accreditation framework shall include provisions regarding well-trained accreditation teams whose members shall be drawn from a pool of California college and university faculty members and administrators, elementary and secondary school teachers and other certificated professionals, and local school board members. For each accreditation visit there shall be one team, whose size, composition, and expertise shall be constituted according to the accreditation framework.

- (c) An accreditation team shall present its report and recommendations to the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the accreditation framework. The committee shall consider the accreditation team report and recommendations, and shall also consider evidence, which may be submitted by the institution, that the team demonstrated bias or acted arbitrarily or capriciously or contrary to the policies of the accreditation framework or the procedural guidelines of the committee.
- (d) **The Committee on Accreditation shall make a single decision to accredit, to accredit with stipulations, or to deny accreditation to an institution's credential programs, pursuant to Section 44373 and the accreditation framework.**
- (e) An institution has the right to appeal to the commission if the procedures or decisions of an accreditation team or the Committee on Accreditation are arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies of the commission or the procedural guidelines of the committee. An institution also has the right to recommend changes in the accreditation policies of the commission, which shall be considered by the commission in consultation with the executive director and the Committee on Accreditation.
- (f) At the request of an institution, the accreditation of an **education** unit or a specific program by a national accrediting body shall substitute for state accreditation provided that the national accrediting body has satisfied the applicable conditions set forth in the accreditation framework.

Appendix B

Accreditation Study Session, May 2005, Commission Agenda item 6A, pages 1-5,
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2005-05/2005-05-6A.pdf>,

Introduction

Throughout education, accreditation plays an important role in assuring the public and students of program and institutional quality. In the preparation of teachers, the status of accreditation conveys that programs offered by institutions meet state adopted standards of quality and effectiveness and that sufficient quality characterizes the preparation of educators. The fundamental tenet of the existing system is that professional educators make professional judgments about the quality of educator preparation programs. This agenda item provides an overview of California's system of accreditation for educator preparation, examines through case studies the policies and procedures of that system, and includes a progress report on the review of the accreditation system that has occurred since June 2004.

Background

Prior to the Ryan Act of 1970, state oversight of educator licensing resided with the Bureau of Teacher Certification in the California Department of Education (CDE). Licensure requirements were defined through coursework and field experience expectations. Candidates submitted applications and transcripts to the Bureau for review and determination of eligibility for the credential. They were awarded a license if all established requirements were met. The Bureau conducted site visits to colleges and universities with two to three member teams of postsecondary educators to determine whether or not the institution should be recognized as eligible to offer educator preparation. During the late 1960s the concept of approved programs was introduced whereby institutions would be approved to offer specific preparation programs. Institutions would be responsible for determining that all requirements were met and would recommend candidates for the credential. However, this concept was not fully implemented before the credentialing system was reformed in 1970.

In 1970, the Ryan Act created the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensure (CTPL), later to be renamed the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), and shifted the licensure of educators and the monitoring of teacher preparation programs to this new entity. The approved programs concept was refined over time and fully implemented by the Commission. During 1971-72, the Commission established an exhaustive set of detailed guidelines to govern the review of educator preparation programs. The guidelines were developed by Commission staff, with input from advisory groups, and addressed such aspects as program administration, faculty qualifications, curriculum, reading instruction, and program evaluation. There was a strong emphasis in these guidelines and in the process through which they were implemented on analyzing the minute details of a program as opposed to a more holistic approach.

In 1973-74, an External Assessment Process was launched with four pilot institutions. Under this new process, teams of thirty or more K-12 professionals and parents conducted site visits at colleges and universities to determine whether institutions were implementing the programs they were approved to offer based on their written responses to the Commission's guidelines. Teams

analyzed programs using a discrepancy approach wherein each element of the program was evaluated against each element of the guidelines to determine whether the program was doing what it said it was doing. Teams were drawn from the region in which the institution was located and received no training prior to conducting a site visit. Each of the pilot institutions were found to have a small number of discrepancies and received approval from the Commission with the requirement that all discrepancies be remedied within one year. This approach to conditional approval has been retained as an aspect of the Commission's accountability system through multiple reforms over the years. For the next two years, the Commission made a number of refinements to the External Assessment Process. In 1974-75 twelve institutions participated in the pilot process. Smaller teams, consisting exclusively of K-12 representative and parents visited the institutions and continued working with the discrepancy process. In the 1975-76 year, fourteen additional institutions participated in the process. One of the changes to the system that year was the addition of higher education professionals to the visiting teams. Teams provided the institutions with the written discrepancy reports, but also engaged them for the first time in dialogue about the overall quality of their programs.

A new Program Evaluation Process was introduced, replacing the External Assessment Process in 1976-77. Refined guidelines were adopted by the Commission that focused on broader domains of quality and moved away from the extreme detail of the earlier guidelines. Quantitative data regarding the number of hours and weeks spent in supervised student teaching and the nature and extent of K-12 and community involvement in the development and evaluation of programs became indicators of program sufficiency evaluated by teams. Mixed teams of higher education, K-12 and parent representatives continued to visit programs, though team size was substantially reduced. Teams of 2-5 individuals, depending on the size of the credential program, were provided with training on the first day of a visit, another first for the Commission. Teams were asked to make more holistic judgments about the overall adequacy of programs. Separate teams were formed for each program area, so multiple teams would be visiting at the same time. Thus the total number of team members visiting an institution could range from three to over thirty depending on the number and size of programs. Each individual program was recommended to the Commission for approval, approval with conditions, probation, or termination.

This was the beginning of a shift by the Commission toward stronger guidelines that focused on aspects of program quality. Three categories of guidelines emerged from this process: (a) Institutional Issues (resources, faculty, admissions, organization); (b) Candidate Competence (program curriculum and candidate outcomes); and (c) Program and Candidate Evaluation (how the program conducted needs analyses, engaged with the field, evaluated and recommended candidates for credentials). Teams began moving away from counting the elements within guidelines that were present in a program and toward making more qualitative judgments about programs. These shifts in the guidelines and procedures for program review were driven by an emerging concept of best practice based on the knowledge and expertise of professionals in the K-12 and higher education communities.

In the late 1980's the Commission started a transition from guidelines to standards for each of its program areas. In 1987 the Commission adopted standards of quality and effectiveness for multiple and single subject credential programs. The program approval process begun in 1976 was retained, but instead of evaluating programs based on guidelines, mixed teams of reviewers

(K-12 and higher education) were trained to review programs based on standards. Commission staff developed and implemented two-day training sessions for larger groups of professionals who formed a pool of reviewers from which teams were chosen.

The Program Evaluation system remained in place until the mid-1990's when the results of an extensive teacher preparation and accountability reform effort came to fruition. Senate Bill 148 by Marian Bergeson had been enacted in 1988 which led to the Commission adoption of an *Accreditation Framework* in May 1993, thus taking the first step in replacing its individual program approval system with a unit wide professional accreditation system. The Commission was among the first in the nation to establish a standards-based teacher preparation system. The background and context for this reform effort were detailed in an extensive analysis conducted by the Commission staff in 1991. Excerpts from this analysis are provided in the next two sections below.

Educator Preparation for California 2000: Background Information for a New Accreditation Framework (excerpted and updated from staff analysis in September 1991)

In the decade from 1980 to 1989, advocates for educational reform and school improvement turned their attention to the quality of teaching and learning in the K-12 schools. With mounting evidence of inadequate student standards, poor morale and high turnover among teachers, increasing numbers of observers expressed support for changes that would "professionalize" education, particularly teaching. The following reforms were among the changes frequently advocated by educational leaders and 'reform commissions' nationally and in California.

- Site-based decision-making that includes strong roles for classroom teachers, and other proposals for teacher empowerment.
- Mentoring programs and intensive summer institutes to upgrade teacher skills while preserving individual discretion and professional legitimacy.
- Basic skills tests to disqualify candidates who lack academic skills that are characteristic of well-educated adults.
- Performance assessments to establish high standards for the subject matter competence and pedagogical skills of beginning teachers.
- Professional standards for the initial preparation of teachers, and professional procedures for reviewing the quality of preservice programs.

Nationally, these proposals and others were recommended by the Holmes Group (1986), the Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession (1986), the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985), and many comparable bodies and leaders. In California, efforts to 'professionalize' teaching were strongly advocated by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the California Commission on the Teaching Profession (1985), the Commission on Teacher Quality (1984), the Business-Education Roundtable (1984), and the Governor's Commission on Educational Quality (1988).

In the context of this whirlwind of reform proposals, educators and policymakers also discussed extensively the review and approval of professional educator preparation programs in California by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Many of these dialogues tended to reinforce

perceptions that had developed during the 1970's -- that the Commission's review and approval of programs was technical and narrow in scope, that it had the effect of inhibiting innovation and diversity in professional preparation, and that it was more bureaucratic than professional. The Commission was transforming its policies and practices, but these reforms were ignored or downplayed by some observers. Nevertheless, the Commission continued to concentrate on improvements in its review of institutional programs.

Conceptual Origins of Senate Bill 148 (Chapter 1455, Statutes of 1988)

Throughout the 1980s, improving the quality and effectiveness of teaching and increasing its attractiveness as a profession were the policy goals of Senator Marian Bergeson, a former teacher and school board member. In 1987, the Senator introduced Senate Bill 148, which included the following reforms in teaching.

- A policy of support for beginning teachers, in the form of guidance and assistance to increase their effectiveness and retention, as a future requirement for earning a professional teaching credential.
- A policy of individual accountability according to standards of teaching performance, to be assessed independently to verify each new teacher's competence, as a future requirement for a professional teaching credential.
- Greater involvement by practitioners, especially teachers, in governing the profession through participation in the deliberations and decisions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Greater independence and autonomy for the professional governing body – the Commission - in establishing and administering high standards and other policies to improve teaching and learning in the schools.
- Higher standards for issuance and renewal of emergency certificates to practitioners who had not fulfilled the conventional standards for membership in the teaching profession.

As enacted, SB 148 included several provisions to direct the Commission in the area of accreditation. Among those were the following:

- 1) The legislation established an Accreditation Advisory Council (AAC). SB 148 dictated the structure of this representative body, which included representatives from each of the segments of higher education and the K-12 community. Two distinct groups fulfilled this requirement of law between 1989 and 1993. The function of the AAC was to advise the Commission regarding the establishment of an accreditation framework.
- 2) Several provisions governed the shift from program approval by the Commission to program accreditation by one or more nongovernmental accrediting entities. Motivated by a desire to "hold professional elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educators responsible for the quality of (educator) preparation," the legislation required the Commission to attempt to delegate the accreditation function to one or more "nongovernmental accrediting entities." Article 10 required that such an entity "include California elementary, secondary, and

postsecondary educators." The law also provided for the contingency in which the Commission could not select a nongovernmental accrediting entity. The Commission determined that it was important, with respect to its role as a professional standards board, to retain some responsibility for this function, and neither practical nor desirable to shift accountability for educator preparation to another agency. The Committee on Accreditation was established as a compromise solution. Consistent with the intent of SB 148, the body is considered to be non-governmental to the extent that it consists of six individuals from higher education and six individuals from K-12 who do not represent, per se, any agency, institution or system. Rather, members of the COA are selected for their distinguished records of accomplishment in education. Pursuant to subsequent legislation, the Commission retained overall responsibility for the accreditation system through its appointed Committee on Accreditation. Particular roles and responsibilities are defined in the *Accreditation Framework*, and described elsewhere in this report.

- 3) Several provisions related to the adoption, contents and use of an accreditation framework by the Commission. Two drafts of an accreditation framework were developed by the AAC during its four-year history. The first draft was rejected by the Commission for a variety of reasons, including (but not limited to) the perception that it would lower expectations for quality in educator preparation, it proposed to eliminate standards of candidate competence and performance, the approach to team size and structure for site visits was flawed, and it emphasized unit accreditation in a manner that would severely undermine the review of individual programs within the institution. The second version of the *Accreditation Framework* was adopted by the Commission in May 1993 for subsequent implementation under Senate Bill 655 (Bergeson, Chapter 426, Statutes of 1993), which became effective on January 1, 1994.

The adoption by the Commission of the *Accreditation Framework* and the creation of the Committee on Accreditation with the responsibility for the direct monitoring of educator preparation programs, brought about three major shifts in the Commission's accountability system:

- 1) The *Framework* shifted the focus from individual credential programs operating independently within an institution, to a "unit-plus" approach, wherein the "unit" refers to the sponsoring agency (e.g., institution), and the "plus" refers to all of the educator preparation programs that are offered by the sponsoring agency. In this manner the Commission and the AAC sought to ensure that the sponsoring agency took appropriate responsibility for all of the credential programs being offered and that each program within the institution continued to be adequately monitored for quality. Unlike the Program Review Process, under the COA, accreditation decisions were made about the institution as a whole.
- 2) The second major shift in this reform had to do with the size and structure of review teams. Pursuant to the *Framework*, the Commission adopted Common Standards that addressed expectations of quality and effectiveness for the unit as a whole. Accreditation teams began to include a Common Standards cluster that focused on institutional issues cutting across all programs. Other clusters were formed within the accreditation team with responsibilities for the basic teaching credential (multiple and single subject), services credentials (administrative services, health services and pupil personnel services) and specialist

credentials (education specialist, reading specialist). The whole accreditation team, including all of the clusters, is now required to vote on the accreditation status of the unit. Any issues or concerns within a particular program area are addressed as stipulations on the accreditation report.

- 3) The *Accreditation Framework* also impacted the role of the accreditation team leader in the process. Under the new system, the team leader serves as the primary point of contact for the team, the institution and the COA regarding the findings and recommendations of the team. Commission staff serve as facilitators of the process, and have primary responsibility for the logistical aspects of a visit.

APPENDIX C

COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

STANDARD 2: UNIT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completion performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

STANDARD 3: RESOURCES

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

STANDARD 4: FACULTY AND INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

STANDARD 5: ADMISSION

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including

sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

STANDARD 6: ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

STANDARD 7: FIELD EXPERIENCE AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

STANDARD 8: DISTRICT-EMPLOYED SUPERVISORS

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

STANDARD 9: ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE COMPETENCE

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.